The Suffragist

5 CENTS

OFFICIAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Entered as second-class matter, November 14, 1913,
at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C.,
under the act of March 8, 1879.

VOL. II | FEBRUARY 14, 1914 | NO. 7

FEB 18 1914 PERIODICAL

NOTES OF THE WEEK

Situation in Congress

Meeting of Demacratuc Caucus of House of Representatives.

On Tuesday evening of last week the Democratic members of the House of Representatives met in Caucus to consider the creation of a Woman Suffrage Committee in the House, the call for the Caucus having been signed by 51 members of the party. By a vote of 124 to 56, the Caucus went on record as holding that the question of Woman Suffrage was a matter for State and not Federal Action, Representative Heflin's substitute motion to this effect being adopted in place of Representative Raker's motion, favoring the creation of a Woman Suffrage Committee.

Oscar W. Underwood, leader of the Democratic party in the House, Champ Clark, Speaker of the House, and A. Mitchell Palmer, Chairman of the Caucus, voted for the Heflin resolution.

By this action the Democratic party has clearly placed itself on record with regard to the Woman Suffrage question.

Discussion in the House of Representatives.

On the following day, during the course of the debate in the House on the Immigration Bill, considerable discussion took place on the action of the Caucus. In this discussion Mr. Lenroot of Wisconsin, Republican, called attention to the position the Democratic party had taken by its Caucus action, and this position was further emphasized by Mr. Underwood in his reply to Mr. Lenroot.

Request for Hearing Before Judiciary Committee.

On the day following the Caucus action, the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage made application to the Judiciary Committee for a hearing on House Resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution, extending the right of suffrage to women. This resolution has been before the Judiciary Committee since last April. No reply has yet been given to the request for a hearing.

Situation in the Senate.

The suffrage resolution stood first on the Senate calendar for Monday, February 9th. It was not considered, however. As soon as the Vice-President announced that the morning business was closed, Senator Bryan of Florida, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the fortification appropriation bill, and this was done, thus cutting off consideration of the suffrage measure.

Petitions on behalf of the suffrage bill were presented on the same day to the Senate by Senator Chamberlain of Oregon.

May 2d Demonstration.

The organization of a nation-wide demonstration on May 2, in behalf of the Federal Amendment, is well under way, Mrs. Lawrence Lewis and Miss Alice Paul having just completed a tour of the New England and Middle Atlantic States, in each of which plans were put on foot for a State demonstration on the 2d. Mrs. Jessie Hardy Stubbs is at present engaged in the organization of similar demonstrations in the States of the Middle West, Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke, is conducting a trip through the Southern States, and Mrs. Emma Smith Devoe, President of the National Council of Woman Voters, is going through the Western States on the same mission.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Through this column the Treasurer has acknowledged all donations received during the year that we have been carrying on the Congressional work in Washington, with the exception of certain contributions given during the time of the procession of last year, which were omitted, by mistake, in making out the list of names for THE SUFFRAGIST, though they were, of course, included in the Treasurer's Annual Report given in last week's SUFFRAGIST. These contributions are acknowledged in this issue.

It has been decided to acknowledge in this column not only contributions, but also membership fees to the Congressional Union and money received for tickets, while the receipts from the purely business departments of THE SUFFRAGIST and the "Literature" Departments will be listed separately.

MARY MORRIS LOCKWOOD,
Treasurer.

Collections made during 1913, but not previously acknowledged in THE SUFFRAGIST.

Anonymous	$10.00
Anonymous	1.25
Mrs. William Kent (Collected)	637.75
Mrs. Helen Gardner (collected)	3.97
Lucia Bennett Ballon	10.00
Alice Parker Lesser	2.00
Miss Jeanette R. Fitzhugh	2.00
Miss Jackson	10.00
Miss Mack	1.00
Anonymous	2.00
Miss Tonk	5.00
Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest	10.00
Carrol Maynard	.50
Mrs. Martha Cranton	2.00
Miss Ellen A. Lent	2.00
Anonymous	.50
Collection	8.70
Collection	6.00
Miss Florence Etheridge	4.00
Miss Nellie Sweet	30.00
Hotel Lyon	10.00
Anonymous	10.00
Anonymous	5.50
Chicago Suffrage League for Bands	25.00
Mrs. Burleson (collected)	25.91
Mrs. Ottenberg (collected)	96.05
Anonymous	75.00
Miss Webster	5.00
Holmes & Son	5.00
Anonymous	53.50
Anonymous	2.00
Miss Winner	.45
Lawyers, per Miss Leonard	25.65
Miss Leonard (collected)	6.75
Collection	1.45
Miss Glenn	6.55
Refund	12.00
Refund Continental Hotel	12.52
Mrs. Baker, Refund	24.00
Anonymous	15.00
Anonymous	1.00
Miss Alice Paul	8.11
Membership dues	10.00
Sale of tickets during 1913	7,933.27

List of Contributions, January 28 to February 6, 1914.

Mrs. Lucretia M. B. Mitchell	$5.00
Collection	4.24
Mrs. A. E. Scranton-Taylor	10.00
Mrs. Jessie Hardy Stubbs	1.00
Miss Helen Paul	14.00
Miss Elsie Hill	2.00
Miss Edith Goode	25.00
Miss Sheldon Jackson	10.00
Mrs. Mina C. Van Winkle	20.00
Miss Sophie Weber	2.00
Mrs. T. J. Robertson	1.00
A Friend	100.00
Mrs. Johns Hopkins	6.00
Miss Mary Burnham	6.00
Mrs. Horatio Gates Lloyd	12.00
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr	35.00
Mrs. Winfred Lewis	6.00
R. E.	6.50
Mrs. G. Colesbury Purves	6.00
Miss Emma Klahr	6.00
Mrs. Chas. Wister Ruschenburger	12.00
Mrs. Shippen Lewis	6.00
Miss Louise Lewis	6.00
Mrs. Henry C. Justice	6.00
Miss G. Sturges	5.00
Anoymous	10.00
Miss Mary Burnham	500.00
Miss Agnes F. Garrels	1.00
Miss Emma L. Waldo	15.00
Miss Cora Mitchell	5.00
Mrs. D. S. Hazard	10.00
Helen C. Scott	10.00
Mrs. William Kent	25.00
Mrs. A. H. Potter	1.25
Mrs. Frederick Nathan	10.00
Bertram W. Sippy	2.00
Collections	6.08
Miss Emily I. Farnum	5.00
Miss Martha Davis	2.00
Miss Emma Klahr	1.00
Miss Bertha Winkler	5.00
Mrs. E. Q. A. Ellis	1.00
Mrs. Charlotte Anita Whitney	1.00
Collection	2.30
Collection	2.01
Miss Bess H. Thompson	1.00
Mrs. Randolph Keith Forrest	5.00
Mrs. E. S. Evans	5.00
Membership fees	9.25
	$10,066.01
Previously acknowledged in THE SUFFRAGIST	17,077.73
Total	$27,143.74

Note:—In issue of January 31st, the item printed "Woman's Equal Suffrage League, $5.00,' should have been Woman's Equal Suffrage League, Wheeling, W. Va., $5.00.

G. G. CORNWELL & SON
Incorporated
Importing Grocers
1415-1417 H STREET

GEO. C. SHAFFER
Florist
Phone, 2406 Main 14th and Eye Sts. N. W.
Washington, D. C.

W. B. MOSES & SONS
Everything for the Home
STORAGE PACKING SHIPPING
F and Eleventh Streets

National Demonstration, May 2d and 9th

There have been pageants, and there have been processions, and there have been demonstrations within the past five years in most of the large cities of this country, the object being to visualize to the reluctant and the unimaginative public the greatly increasing strength of the Suffrage movement. None of these demonstrations approach in size and importance the mighty demonstration which the Congressional Union announces for May 2d, 1914. On that day, and at the same hour in the afternoon, every State in the Union in at least one city, will hold a Suffrage demonstration. In some cities this will take the form of a procession, in others a gigantic mass meeting, and in still others a pageant. In some States, notably New Jersey, the demonstration will be State-wide, a chain of demonstrations extending from city to city. Each one of the meetings will pass a resolution calling for the passage of the Federal Amendment for Woman Suffrage, and a delegate from every Congressional District in the United States will be appointed by the various Suffrage organizations to carry the resolutions to Washington where, on May 9, the nation-wide demonstration will culminate in a great procession to the national Capitol. There the delegates will present the resolutions and call for immediate action on the Suffrage Bill.

The Washington procession will be preceded by a meeting, early in the afternoon, at one of the theaters, of the delegates from the forty-eight States. It is proposed to decorate the theater with purple, white and gold, the colors of the Congressional Union, and as May is the month of flowers in Washington, the place should present an exquisite vision of a fairy-land of blossoms. Lilacs, violets, narcissus, spring blossoms of every kind will be used, and when, after the meeting, the procession forms in Lafayette Park, the marchers will bear armloads of the purple, white and yellow flowers. Thus sweetly laden the procession will march the length of Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol and, before dispersing, to present the resolutions, will form itself into a monster mass meeting on the Plaza in front of the Capitol steps.

Will Show Political Strength.

This mighty demonstration, with deputations from every Congressional District in the United States, cannot fail to impress the party in power with the rapidly increasing demand for the Federal Amendment. It will certainly prove to the Democratic party that there is no section of the country where women are not actively campaigning, and it ought to prove to the most obstinately unseeing party member that sooner or later his personal prejudices must yield to the overwhelming public opinion in favor of real democracy.

The first steps towards organizing this greatest of demonstrations was taken in the latter part of January when Miss Alice Paul and Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, of the Executive Committee of the Union, made a two weeks' tour in half a dozen Eastern States. The first stop was made in Philadelphia where, at the home of Mrs. Lewis, a conference was held with Miss Mary Winsor, President of the Pennsylvania Limited Suffrage Association. Mrs. Thomas, President of the Suffrage Society of Philadelphia County, Mrs. Winfred Lewis, President of the Philadelphia Equal Franchise League, Miss Harriet Dulles, of the Philadelphia Branch of the Congressional Union, and Mrs. George Piersoll, of the Woman Suffrage Party of Philadelphia. A second and a larger meeting was held later at the Suffrage headquarters in the Hale Building. At this meeting Miss Paul and Mrs. Lewis conferred with representatives and officers of all the Suffrage Associations. Among those present were Miss Caroline Katzenstein, Executive Secretary of the Philadelphia Suffrage Association, Miss Sophia Dulles, Secretary of the Equal Franchise League, Miss Lida Stokes Adams, representing the Woman Suffrage Party, Mr. Henry Justice, Secretary of the Men's League for Woman Suffrage, Mr. Eric Sanville, President of the University of Pennsylvania Men's League, Miss Lucy Lewis, of the Suffrage Society of Philadelphia County, Miss Winsor, Mrs. Thomas, Miss Elizabeth Lewis, Secretary of the Procession Committee, and Mr. Grazier, of the Men's League.

MRS. JESSIE HARDY STUBBS.
Who is organizing in the Middle West for the Nation-wide demonstration of May 2nd.

The Pennsylvania Suffrage Associations had planned a procession in Philadelphia for May 9, but very generously changed the date and agreed to make their procession a part of the nation-wide demonstration on May 2. Mrs. George Piersoll will act as a chairman of the Philadelphia procession.

In New York, the next city visited, Miss Paul and Mrs. Lewis conferred with officers of the Empire State Committee of which Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt is Chairman; Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, President of the Women's Political Union, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, President of the Political Equality League, Miss King, Secretary of the Equal Franchise Society, Mrs. Marian Cothren, of the Woman's Suffrage Party of Brooklyn, and others. Arrangements for the New York City demonstration were left in the hands of Mrs. Mary Beard and Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, the two members of the Executive Committee of the Congressional Union, who reside in New York.

In Hartford, Connecticut, and in New Haven conferences were held with Mrs. Thomas Hepburn, President of the State Suffrage Association, Mrs. Edward Porritt, Press Secretary of the Association, Mrs. Toscan Bennett, Treasurer, Mrs. Carlos F. Stoddard, Chairman of the New Haven County Association, Mrs. William Hincks, former President of the State Association, Mrs. Herbert H. Knox, Chairman of the Fairfield County Association, Miss Alys Gregory, State Organizer, and Miss Elizabeth Hooker. Hartford has already been chosen for the scene of the demonstration.

Mrs. James Alger, of Providence, President of the Woman Suffrage Party of Rhode Island, has kindly assumed responsibility for the organization of the Rhode Island demonstration.

Boston Women Active.

Two days were spent in Boston, where Miss Paul and Mrs. Lewis met the Executive Board of the Massachusetts Suffrage Association, and on the day following they addressed a meeting of many of the leading suffrage workers of Boston and surrounding towns. Among the prominent women who have agreed to cooperate to make the demonstration a success are Mrs. Gertrude Leonard, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, Mrs. Maul Wood Park, Mrs. Theresa Crowley, Miss Agnes Ryan, Miss Laura Murdock, Mrs. Olive Hasbrouck, Miss Mary Gray, Mrs. Richard Davenport Coe, Mrs. F. L. Milliken, Mrs. Lillale B. Gray, Miss Katherine Morey, Mrs. John C. Lea and Mrs. George H. Stearns. The Massachusetts suffragists have been making extensive preparations for a great procession to be held in Boston on May 16, but they, like the Philadelphia associations, perceived the advantage of the nation-wide demonstration, and kindly agreed to hasten their preparations in order to join, on May 2d, in the general demonstration. While in Boston the Washington women were entertained at Miss Blackwell's home in Dorchester and at the home of Mrs. Gertrude Leonard, Chairman of the Procession Committee.

Demonstration in the West and South

Mrs. Jessie Hardy Stubbs, Press Chairman of the Congressional Union, left Washington on February 7th to organize for the big demonstration in the States of the Middle West. Mrs. Stubbs will visit Illinois, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio and West Virginia. Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke has undertaken to organize demonstrations on May 2d in the Southern States. She will arrange processions or rallies in North and South Carolina, Virginia, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia and Florida. In the far West preparations are in full swing. Mrs. Emma Smith De Voe, President of the National Council of Women Voters, will organize Washington, Utah and Idaho. On February 14th Mrs. De Voe will attend a meeting in Boise, Idaho, where, with the assistance of Miss Roberts, of Boise, and others, a movement will be started to enlist the services in every Suffrage State of the members of the National Council of Women Voters. In Colorado arrangements for a demonstration are being made under the personal direction of Senator Helen Ring Robinson. The Suffragist will report progress of the demonstration work in every issue until May.

VOL. II FEBRUARY 14, 1914 No. 7

The Suffragist

Official weekly newspaper of the

CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

COMMITTEE

Miss ALICE PAUL, N. J., Chairman
Miss LUCY BURNS, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. DONALD HOOKER, Md., Chairman of Finance
CRYSTAL EASTMAN BENEDICT, N. Y.
Mrs. MARY BEARD, N. Y.
Miss ELSIE HILL, Conn.
Mrs. GILSON GARDNER, D. C.
Mrs. WM KENT, Calif.
Mrs. LAWRENCE LEWIS, JR., Pa.

Editor: RHETA CHILDE DORR
General Manager: JESSIE HARDY STUBBS
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICE :
1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single copies . . . . . 5 cents

For CHANGE OF ADDRESS, send both old and new addresses.

Checks, drafts, and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer.

DARLING 34 PRINTER

SENATE AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NUMBER ONE Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United State of America in Congress Assembled (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE—

"Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF AMENDMENT

Introduced:
In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:
In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:
In the Senate: June 13, 1913, unanimous favorable report.

Discussed:
In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, demands immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.

Present Status:
In the Senate: Awaiting action.
In the House: Before the Judiciary Committee.

President Wilson and the Canal Tolls

"Until the Party, as such, has considered a matter of this very supreme importance, and taken its position, I am not at liberty to speak for it; and yet I am not at liberty to speak for it as an individual, for I am not an individual." —*President Wilson to the workingwomen's deputation, February 2*, 1914.

Not all who heard President Wilson pronounce these words were received into thinking them anything more than an evasion, a "diplomatic utterance," as such things are called. A few there were, however, who went away from the White House depressed and disappointed. They really believed that the President meant what he said, that he was confiding in them one of the sacred policies by which the country is being governed. President Wilson was the servant of his party. He was going to do what the party, in its platform, promised the country that he would do. Moreover, he wasn't going to do anything else. No matter how much he yearned to effect some reform the platform forgot to mention he wasn't going to yield to temptation and effect it, because the party had not told him to. Perhaps some of the credulous, despairing of suffrage, went home and looked up the Democratic Platform of 1912 to see for themselves what could happen to the country in the way of legislation during President Wilson's administration. If any woman did that she may have noticed two little paragraphs which read as follows:

"We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal.

"We also favor legislation forbidding the use of the Panama Canal by ships owned or controlled by railroad carriers engaged in transportation competitive with the canal."

The canal tolls plank in the platform was endorsed with great enthusiasm by the Democratic Convention. In fact not a single voice was raised against it. Tolls exemption for American vessels was almost the most popular thing in the way of planks that the Democratic carpenters handled that week in Baltimore. Tolls exemption figured in almost every speech made by Mr. Bryan and the other orators during the campaign. It was one of the policies on which the Democratic Party went to the country.

Yet, within a few days after President Wilson had told the women that he *could not* recommend a Suffrage measure to Congress because the Democratic Party had not passed on Suffrage, he did something still more impossible; he demanded of Congress the repeal of the free tolls provision in the canal act. He not only recommended a reform not endorsed by his party, a thing he told the women he would never do, but he demanded a reform which the Democratic Party had expressly declared against. And he will get his reform. The Washington Times said editorially: "President Wilson has demanded the repeal of the free toll provision in the canal act, and it needs no gift of prophecy to foresee that a large number of the Democratic members of the House and Senate who voted for free tolls will hasten to beat a retreat. The question will not be tried on its merits. For most of the Democratic membership of both houses it will be sufficient to know what the President wants done."

Some of the Democratic leaders, rather aghast at this audacious repudiation of platform policy, yet anxious to obey the crack of the whip, have made a very brilliant suggestion. They advise a referendum of the convention delegates with a view to finding out the truth of a horrid rumor, to wit, that the free tolls plank was slipped into the platform when everybody's back was turned. It was, in fact, handed to the party by a trick.

We like that suggestion immensely. You could do almost anything you liked with a simple device like that. For instance you could take a referendum and find out that woman suffrage was left out of the Democratic Platform by an oversight, or even that it was cut out of the platform at the lunch hour, like a Mona Lisa out of its frame. Then, of course, the President could tell Congress to appoint a suffrage committee in the lower house and carry the amendment to the voting stage. He might even order Congress to pass the bill, without receding from the policy outlined to Mrs. Glendower Evans and her deputation of working women. Certainly what is possible for a canal act ought to be possible for a suffrage amendment.

Democratic Party and Woman Suffrage

A very important event has occurred in the history of the woman suffrage movement. This is the definite lining up of the Democratic party against woman suffrage as a national measure. This position was taken by the Democratic caucus of the House and was further emplasized by the words of Mr. Underwood on the floor of the House the next day. This action, taken in connection with the President's dodging of the question, established beyond all doubt the attitude upon this quesion of the party is power.

The issue has become clear cut. Unless the Democratic party reconsiders its present position, Suffragists must necessarily regard that party as an obstruction in the path of their campaign. They cannot fail to hold the party, as a party, responsible for the inaction of Congress on their measure.

We ask the Democratic party, before it is too late, to consider this question again. We bid them remember that they have in their hands the opportunity of helping or hindering the most truly Democratic movement since the Civil War.

We appeal to them also in the name of expediency. They have three votes to lose in the Senate and they lose control of this government. There are nine states in which women vote for United States Senators. The result in the Senatorial elections in these states will undoubtedly depend largely upon the action on suffrage taken by the Democratic party.

The Democratic Caucus and the Woman Suffrage Movement

After the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, as a result of the action of its Democratic members, had decided against granting a special committee on Woman Suffrage, the matter was appealed to the Democratic Caucus.

In order to call a caucus it was necessary to secure the signatures of fifty Democrats to a petition addressed to Representative Palmer, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Democratic Caucus, asking him to call the Caucus together. It was relatively easy to secure the necessary number of signatures. There follows a list of those Representatives who signed the petition for a Caucus on House Resolution 2, calling for a House Committee on Woman Suffrage, to which "all proposed action touching the subject of Woman Suffrage" shall be referred.

Name:	State:	District:
. R. Connelly,	Kansas	Sixth
Guy T. Helvering,	Kansas	Fifth
George White,	Ohio	Fifteenth
D. S. Church,	California	Seventh
A. R. Brodbeck,	Penna.	Twentieth
Frank T. O'Hair,	Illinois	Eighteenth
W. W. Bailey,	Penna.	Nineteenth
John V. Lesher,	Penna.	Sixteenth
Henry George, Jr.,	New York	Twenty-first
Maurice Connelly,	Iowa	Third
Dudley Doolittle,	Kansas	Fourth
Edward Keating,	Colorado	At Large
Frank O. Smith,	Maryland	Fifth
Tom Stout,	Montana	At Large
P. L. Dershem,	Penna.	Seventeenth
John M. Evans,	Montana	At Large
R. Y. Thomas, Jr.,	Kentucky	Third
Michael Donohoe,	Penna.	Fifth
. H. Rothermel,	Penna.	Thirteenth
Thomas J. Sculley,	New Jersey	Third
H. H. Seldom-ridge,	Colorado	Second
Finly H. Gray,	Indiana	Sixth
K. D. McKellar,	Tennessee	Tenth
James F. Byrnes,	S. Carolina	Second
R. J. Bulkley,	Ohio	Twenty-first
S. E. Gorman,	Illinois	Third
P. U. Stone,	Illinois	Sixteenth
P. H. Tavenner,	Illinois	Fourteenth
Robt. H. Gittins,	New York	Fortieth
Chas. B. Smith,	New York	Forty-first
. R. Clancy,	New York	Thirty-fifth
William Kettner,	California	Eleventh
P. O'Shaunessy,	Rhode Island	First
Wooda N. Carr,	Penna.	Twenty-third
P. O. Lobeck,	Nebraska	Second
Horace Vaughan,	Texas	First
Jefferson M. Levy,	New York	Fourteenth
P. P. Hill,	Illinois	Twenty-fifth
W. W. Sims,	Tennessee	Eighth
. R. Walker,	Georgia	Eleventh
. Kirkpatrick,	Iowa	Sixth
Robt. Crosser,	Ohio	At Large
. B. Thompson,	Oklahoma	At Large
Jos. Taggart,	Kansas	Second
. R. Sherwood,	Ohio	Ninth
Eugene E. Reed,	New Hamp.	First
W. B. Francis,	Ohio	Sixteenth
. Wilson,	Florida	Third
John B. Peterson,	Indiana	Tenth
James M. Graham,	Illinois	Twenty-first
W. E. Williams,	Illinois	At Large

By examination of the roll call which follows, it will be seen that not all who signed the petition were willing to vote with us in caucus. It is interesting to note that Illinois contributed seven signatures, the largest number coming from any one state.

The date of the Caucus was Tuesday, February 3rd; the hour 8 P. M. There were rumors during the day that an attempt was being made to prevent a quorum (146) from assembling, in which case no business could be transacted. There were close to 200 members present, however. This is as large an attendance as ever assembled to consider currency measures, tariff revision, etc., showing clearly the realization of the importance of woman suffrage even in the minds of hostile gentlemen.

Rep. Garrett, of Tennessee, acting chairman, called the caucus to order. Immediately Representative Bartlett, of Georgia, made a point of "no quorum" and moved to adjourn. Representative Keating, of Colorado, demanded a roll call on this motion. About eighteen men (enough to carry) by rising vote called for aye and no vote on it.

The men began to come in in large numbers until the roll call on Bartlett's motion to adjourn stood 65 to 89. His motion was thus lost, and discussion was on.

At once Representative Baker, of California, introduced his House Resolution on the creation of a committee on Woman Suffrage. He spoke five minutes to the resolution, under the rules, during which time he was interrupted almost constantly by hostile members. His time having been so abridged, he asked unanimous consent for extension of time for five minutes. Representatives Bartlett, of Georgia, objected, and Mr. Baker was obliged to discontinue his remarks.

Representative Hardwick, of Georgia, one of the four members of the Rules Committee, who voted against the resolution when before that Committee, who voted against the resolution when before that Committee, replied to Mr. Baker's speech with only one or two interruptions. Mr. Hardwick stated at length that it was a matter for state and not Federal legislation.

Representative Heflin, of Alabama, who has made himself prominent from time to time in the House, by his extreme statements on woman suffrage, rose to introduce the following substitute resolution:

"RESOLED that it is the sense of this caucus that the question of suffrage is a State and not a Federal question."

Representative Raker rose to a point of order, insisting that such a resolution was not germane to the subject before the Caucus. Representative Palmer, of Pennsylvania, who was then in the chair, overruled Mr. Raker's objection, and Mr. Heflin proceeded to speak to his resolution. He discoursed on the serious menace of woman suffrage, whether it came as the result of state of or national action.

The previous question was then moved and the vote stood 92 to 87, thus shutting off all further debate by a margin of five votes.

The final roll call, which was on the Heflin substitute, was as follows:

Against the Heflin Resolution.

Name:	State:	Decker	Missouri
Adair	Indiana	Deitrick	Mass.
Baker	N. Jersey	Dershem	Penna.
Brown	New York	Donohoe	Penna.
Buchanan	Illinois	Doolittle	Kansas
Carew	New York	Evans	Montana
Church	Calif.	Fitz Henry	Illinois
Connelley	Kansas	Foster	Illinois
Crosser	Ohio	Francis	Ohio
George	New York	Raker	California
Gilmore	Mass.	Reed	N. H.
Goulden	New York	Reily	Conn.
Gray	Indiana	Sabath	Illinois
Hayden	Arizona	Scully	N. Jersey
Keat	Colorado	Seldom-ridge	Colorado
Kettner	California	Sherwood	Ohio
Kinkead	Nebraska	Smith	Maryland
Levy	New York	Smith	New York
Lobeck	Nebraska	Stevens	N. H.
Logne	Penna.	Stone	Illinois
McAndrews	Illinois	Stout	Montana
McDermott	Illinois	Stringer	Illinois
Metz	New York	Taylor	Colorado
Mitchell	Mass.	Taylor	New York
Neely	Virginia	Thomas	Kentucky
O'Hair	Illinois	Thompson	Oklahoma
O'Shaunessy	R. I.	Townsend	N. Jersey
Peterson	Indiana	Williams	Illinois
Rainey	Illinois		

The Heflin resolution was thus adopted by a vote of 124 to 56, the Democratic Party thus plainly putting itself on record through its caucus action as being opposed to the consideration of Suffrage by the Federal Government, and as being even against permitting the subject to be considered in Congress by a special committee devoted to this topic.

For the Heflin Resolution.

Name:	State:	Doughton	N. Carolina
Abercrombie	Alabama	Driscoll	New York
Adamson	Georgia	Edwards	Georgia
Aiken	S. Carolina	Estopinal	Louisiana
Allen	Ohio	Faison	N. Carolina
Ansberry	Ohio	Finley	S. Carolina
Ashbrook	Ohio	Flood	Virginia
Bailey	Penna.	Gard	Ohio
Baltz	Illinois	Garrett	Texas
Barkley	Kentucky	Gittins	New York
Barnhart	Indiana	Glass	Virginia
Bathrick	Ohio	Goeke	Ohio
Beakes	Michigan	Graham	Illinois
Bell	Georgia	Gregg	Texas
Booher	Missouri	Griffin	New York
Borchers	Illinois	Gudger	N. Carolina
Bowdle	Ohio	Hammond	Minnesota
Bradbeck	Penna.	Hardwick	Georgia
Brown	West Va.	Hay	Virginia
Bruckner	New York	Heflin	Alabama
Buchanan	Texas	Henry	Texas
Burgess	Texas	Hensley	Missouri
Burnett	Alabama	Holland	Virginia
Byrnes	S. Carolina	Houston	Tennessee
Callaway	Texas	Howard	Georgia
Candler	Mississippi	Hull	Tennessee
Cantrill	Kentucky	Humphreys	Mississipi
Carr	Penna.	Johnson	S. Carolina
Clark	Florida	Key	Ohio
Clark	Missouri	Kindel	Colorado
(Speaker)		Kitchin	N. Carolina
Collier	Mississippi	Lazaro	Louisiana
Conry	New York	Lee	Georgia
Cox	Indiana	Lesher	Penna.
Cullop	Indiana	Lever	S. Carolina
Dent	Alabama	Lieb	Indiana
Dickinson	Missouri	Loft	New York
Dies	Texas	Lonergon	Connecticut
Diefenderfer	Penna.	Morrison	Indiana
Dixon	Indiana	Moss	Indiana
Donovan	Connecticut	Murray	Oklahoma
Dooling	New York	O'Brien	New York
		Oldfield	Arkansas
		Padgett	Tennessee

Page	N. Carolina	Talbot	Maryland
Palmer	Penna.	Talcott	New York
Park	Georgia	Taylor	Alabama
Paiten	New York	Taylor	Arkansas
Post	Ohio	Ten Eyck	New York
	Mississippi	Tuttle	New Jersey
Rayburn	Texas	Underwood	Alabama
Reilly	Wisconsin		(Leader)
Rothermel	Penna.	Vaughan	Texas
Rouse	Kentucky	Walker	Georgia
	Missouri	Watkins	Louisiana
Rucker	Missouri	Watson	Virginia
Russell	Missouri	Weaver	Oklahoma
Saunders	Virginia	White	Ohio
Shackel-		Wilson	Florida
ford	Missouri	Wilson	New York
Sisson	Mississippi	Wither-	
Stanley	Kentucky	spoon	Mississippi
Stedman	N. Carolina	Young	Texas
Stephans	Mississippi		

Discussion of the Caucus Action on the Floor of the House.

On the day following the action of the caucus, considerable discussion of the event took place in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Lenroot, of Wisconsin, Republican, who had voted as a member of the Rules Committee for the creation of a Woman Suffrage Committee, brought up the subject during the debate on the immigration bill. He said, as quoted in the Congressional Record:

"Mr. Chairman, up to yesterday this matter of equal suffrage in the United States and equal suffrage in England were two entirely distinct questions. In this country, whether equal suffrage was a right or whether it was a matter of expediency, was one on which there was honest difference of opinion. But the Democratic Party last night by its action put this question on the same plane that it now occupies in England, for you gentlemen by your caucus last night undertook to say that suffragists shall not have an opportunity to be heard before a committee of the Congress of the United States. (Applause.) And that is what the militant suffragists of England complain of, namely, the right to be heard. And you, the party in power in this country today, have now assumed as a party the responsibility of saying that they shall not have the right to be heard in the United States."

Mr. Underwood, leader of the Democratic party in the House, replied after an interval, as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, I was amazed at the statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Lenroot), when he went out of his way to say that the action of the Democratic party last night was intended to prevent the women of this country from being heard on the question as to whether the Constitution of the United States shall be amended or not, so as to grant woman suffrage.

"My distinguished friend from Wisconsin is one of the ablest and most learned men in ths House, and he knew as well as you and I knew, when he made the partisan address that he has just completed, that the great Committee on the Judiciary of this House has been vested for many years with jurisdiction over this very question; that it has repeatedly granted hearings to the women of the United States on the question as to whether or not legislation shall be passed submitting to the States a constitutional amendment for woman suffrage. During the many years that the gentleman's party was in power the same rules in this House existed as exist today. As a matter of fact, at one time I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary myself, and I have had the pleasure of listening to the able arguments of Miss Susan B. Anthony before that committee. I have heard at different times the cause of woman suffrage advocated before the committee when the gentleman's party was in power, and I noticed through that entire series of years that the gentleman's party continually refused to report the resolution that these ladies desired.

"Now, the proposition that came before the Democratic caucus last night was merely, in the first place, to provide for a new committee, to give jurisdiction to a new committee—a jurisdiction that was already possessed by one of the ablest committees of this House, which has had jurisdiction of that question almost since the beginning of the Government. There is no objection on the part of these ladies as to what committee they shall go before. They wanted their resolution reported, and they thought they could not get it reported from the committee having the matter in charge and wanted to create a new committee to report it. That was all. It was not a question of taking away from them any constitutional right to be heard. It was merely the fact that they recognized that this House would not pass a resolution of that kind."

Mr. Lenroot then asked the question:

"Will the gentleman, as leader of the majority, use his influence in the House to report that resolution so that we may have an opportunity to vote on it," to which Mr. Underwood replied:

"I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I would not, because I am not in favor of it. If there is one fundamental principle that my party stands for, it is local self-government. (Applause on the Democratic side.) If the Democratic Party stands for one thing above all others, in reference to local self-government, it is that the right of franchise should be governed by the States of the Union and not by the National Government."

This statement was greeted with applause from the Democratic side, according to the report in the Congressional Record.

The following dialogue then took place (all quotations being from the Congressional Record):

Mr. Lenroot. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my distinguished friend from Alabama (Mr. Underwood), he knows quite as well as I do that the Committee on the Judiciary, with the work now pending before it, will be absolutely unable to give due and proper consideration to this question.

The gentleman from Alabama refers to the fact that committee had jurisdiction of this question when the Republican Party was in power. It is true; and the gentleman from Alabama also knows that one of the reasons why there is a Democratic majority here today was the fact that he and I, in common with many others, asserted then, as the fact was, that the Judiciary Committee was a morgue for all good legislation that was introduced into this House. (Applause.)

Mr. Underwood. If the gentleman will allow me, that was under a Republican administration. (Applause on the Democratic side.)

Mr. Lenroot. It was, and I am a Republican, and I criticized that quite as much as did the gentleman from Alabama; and the gentleman from Alabama now admits that so far as this resolution is concerned he and his party propose that the Judiciary Committee shall be a morgue for this resolution.

Mr. Underwood. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. Lenroot. Yes.

Mr. Underwood. It is perfectly proper for a great party in this country to take a position on a measure?

Mr. Lenroot. Yes.

Mr. Underwood. Now, I have said that the Democratic Party last night took the distinctive position that it was not in favor of this legislation, because it was in favor of the States controlling the question of suffrage. Now, is it not perfectly proper, if that is the position of the party, not to report that resolution?

Mr. Lenroot. It is perfectly proper to oppose it, but it is not perfectly proper to deny upon a great question the right to a hearing, which you have done. Now, the gentleman from Alabama a moment ago, when I asked him whether he would favor giving the House itself an opportunity to vote upon this resolution, said he would not vote to give the House that opportunity, because he himself was not in favor of the resolution. Mr. Chairman, have we come to the point in this House where, because a man is opposed to a certain proposition, he is therefore opposed to the House itself having a right to vote upon it?

Mr. Underwood. The gentleman will not misquote me?

Mr. Lenroot. I did not misquote the gentleman. I appeal to the Record.

Mr. Underwood. The gentleman misunderstood me, then. I not only said I was opposed to it, but I said the party on this side of the Chamber was opposed to it, and the party that has control of the legislation in Congress certainly has the right openly and above board to say that it will not support a measure if it is not in accordance with its principles.

Mr. Lenroot. That is true; but there is a distinction between supporting a measure and giving the House a right to vote upon the measure.

Mr. Underwood. The gentleman recognizes the fact that we can not vote upon every measure.

Mr. Lenroot. Now, if the gentleman wishes to take the position that the Members on that side are unwilling to let the House of Representatives vote upon this question, then he is entirely welcome to take that position.

Mr. Underwood. The gentleman from Wisconsin began his first remark by stating that the Democratic Party had taken its position last night, and it did, when by a two-thirds vote it fixed our position on that matter.

Mr. Lenroot. The gentleman from Alabama and I are getting very close together as to what the situation really is. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say for myself that if this resolution was reported to the House I should vote against it, and I am with the genleman from Alabama, so far as State rights are concerned, upon this question, but I believe that this question is of such importance that the House itself ought to have the right to vote upon it, and the people of this country ought to have the right to know how every Member of this House stands individually upon that question, and, more than all, those who favor the resolution are entitled to a fair hearing and consideration of the subject, which is now denied them."

The discussion then reverted to the immigration bill and nothing further was said about the suffrage question.

The Kenyon Bill Becomes Law.

Shortly after noon on Saturday, February 7, President Wilson signed the Kenyon Bill for the abatement of houses of ill-fame in the District of Columbia, thus putting an end to openly flaunted and tolerated vice in the National Capital.

At least, it is hoped so. Within half an hour after the bill became law, Major Sylvester, chief of police, called a meeting of captains of the various police districts of the city, and issued orders for the immediate enforcement of the law. According to his orders the trade in woman's flesh must end in Washington. But at the same hour that Major Sylvester called his police captains together another conference on the Kenyon law was being held. Robert I. Miller, a man who has the right to practice law in the community, and several women managers of resorts in the Red Light district, were the principals in this conference, the object of which was to defy and overthrow the Kenyon law. According to Mr. Miller's orders, at least one house of bondage must openly continue in trade until the owner of the property is proceeded against, "In that case," Mr. Miller is quoted as declaring, "I shall take the matter to the Supreme Court, on the ground that the law is unconstitutional."

The whole history of the Kenyon "Red Light Bill," as it was known, ought to interest the women of this country, especially those who still cherish the delusion that they are represented at the polls and in Congress by men.

Provisions of the Bill.

The Kenyon Bill, as has been explained in THE SUFFRAGIST, is modelled on an Iowa statute which has operated with success in Des Moines and other Iowa cities, and which has been adopted in part or as a whole in eleven other States. The bill provides that whoever shall "erect, establish, continue, maintain, use, own, occupy or re-lease" any building or part of a building for immoral purposes is guilty of a nuisance and shall be enjoined and abated without the formality of a jury trial. Any citizen who has knowledge that prostitution is being carried on in a building, house, apartment or room, can petition, that is, complain to the proper authority, in the case of Washington to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, and through him bring a suit in equity perpetually to enjoin the person or persons maintaining the place, as well as the owners of the property, against continuing the business. In order to ensure the enforcement of the law a tax of $300 is placed on the property, this tax to remain a perpetual lien on all property, real and personal, connected with the establishment."

This law, which is generally known as the Iowa Abatement Law, is no panacea. It does not entirely suppress the social evil. Perhaps it does not suppress much of it except locally. But it is the only measure ever devised that has even made a dent in the most ghastly of all evils. If it were applied on a nation-wide scale it would probably greatly curtail the White Slave traffic, and would certainly reduce prostitution. It would put the White Slaver out of business because he must have a large territory to work in. It would make prostitution expensive for the owners of brothels, instead of extremely profitable as at present, and would thus render prostitution, on anything but a very small and a clandestine scale, impossible. Of course, if nothing else was done against prostitution, crime would increase among women, because most underpaid working women would be intelligent enough to steal rather than starve. The Abatement Law is only a beginning, but any one who sincerely desires to get rid of prostitution knows that it is a good beginning. That sixty-two members of the House of Representatives voted against the Kenyon Bill is no direct evidence that many Congressmen desired prostitution to continue. It merely indicated that men have not yet grasped the horror of the situation, as women have. The debate on the bill revealed clearly that its best friends were only vaguely aware of it. It showed once more how utterly and totally men are unfit to represent women or to legislate for them without the co-operation of the women.

Illuminating House Debate

On January 26, 1914, the House went into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of District bills, and the Kenyon Bill was called up for debate by Representative Johnson of Kentucky. Mr. Johnson yielded the floor to Mr. Caraway of Arkansas, who made a strong, if somewhat academic speech, in favor of the bill. At the end of his speech Mr. Caraway read a letter which in itself furnished all the arguments any right minded human being ought to need to convince him that the bill should pass. It was a letter from a broken-hearted woman, who, knowing that Mr. Caraway had the bill in charge, write to him begging, for the sake of her only son, who was being ruined physically and morally in the Red Light districts of Washington, that he do everything in his power to pass the bill. It was a simple and infinitely touching human document, a cry from the muted lips of all the voiceless women in the world. Save my child. Nothing else matters.

Mr. J. Hampton Moore of Pennsylvania, opposed the bill out of a chivalrous regard for the 300 known prostitutes who were threatened with eviction from their "homes." Breaking up the home is a serious business. Mr. Moore's convictions on the subject, as reported in the Congressional Record, deserve to be repeated.

Mr. Moore. "* * * If this injunction law is enacted, and the proprietors of these houses would be put out of business, so to speak, it will follow that these three hundred women will have to go elsewhere, will it not?"

Mr. Caraway. "They will have to go elsewhere or abandon their course of living."

Mr. Moore. "Will the gentleman tell, since I see that he has given careful thought to this subject, whether there is any method provided by any of our friends who believe in the uplift of humanity to relieve the situation in which these unfortunate women find them selves?"

Although Mr. Caraway had stated in his speech that responsible organizations and special committees of men and women had offered to care for every one of the women, shelter them, if they would accept shelter, train them for industry and find them employment if they would take employment, he repeated the assurance for the benefit of Mr. Moore.

Mr. Stanley E. Bowdle of Ohio, broke into the speech of Mr. Prouty of Iowa, who was explaining the workings of the law in his State. Ohio women are entitled to Mr. Bowdle's remarks verbatim.

Mr. Bowdle. "Does the gentleman not know that this question of prostitution has been discussed and has plagued legislators for 10,000 years, and that little or no progress has been made with it? And is it not primarily a moral question?"

Mr. Prouty did not know. Apparently nobody in the chamber knew that prostitution has only recently begun to "plague" legislators. Apparently no one was prepared to prove that prostitution is not primarily a moral question. Apparently no one knew that it is entirely a social and an economic question. As long as women are politically inferior to men they will remain economically inferior. And as long as they are economically inferior they are at the mercy of men. The strongest of them can keep themselves from starvation. The rest, unless they marry, must go into prostitution.

What Every Congressman Known

But not a man in the House of Representatives said anything like that. What they did say, after they got down to actual business, was that the bill ought not to pass because it would necessitate changes in the laws affecting real estate exchange. Mr. Gardner of Massachusetts, introduced this aspect of the case, and he was followed by Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan, who said that: "It would embarrass many people in their real estate transactions. It would compel them to make public their transactions and their dealings one with another in relation to matters in which the public is in no way interested except in the matter of assessing the property for taxation."

From that time on until the closure of debate the House of Representatives talked about nothing but real estate. They argued for and against the bill, and pretty fiercely, too, solely from the point of view of buyers and sellers of city property. Not a word about the necessity of checking diseases which are more contagious and more fatal than smallpox and much more prevalent than tuberculosis. Not a word about the thousands of virtuous women who endure lives of physical agony because of their husband's dealings with prostitution. Not a word about the thousands of blind babies. Not a word about the long procession of girls fed every year to the monster. Not a word about the splendid boyhood annually sacrificed. *Not a word any woman member of Congress would have spoken on the subject.*

Would the bill embarrass real estate transactions? That was the question. A majority of the House of Representatives agreed that real estate transactions would not suffer under the Kenyon law and the bill was passed.

The law, thus created, is by no means safely established in the statutes. It is still in danger from men; and women are powerless to protect it from those men, who are not all owners of disorderly houses, but are respectable citizens, Congressmen, distinguished jurists. Floor Leader Mann and Attorney General McReynolds are quoted as doubting the constitutionality of the law, Congress, in their opinion, having no right to levy a tax against a piece of property because a permanent injunction has been granted. The last jot and title of justice must be insured for sacred property whether the race perishes or not. If the Supreme Court of the United States declares the law constitutional it is in danger from another source. A bill, it is rumored, is already being prepared to grant a jury trial to any defendant under the Kenyon law. The upholders in Congress of tolerated vice are well aware of the leniency with which the average jury of men deals with cases of this sort.

Does any thinking woman still believe that prostitution will be abolished, or even materially lessened until women are politically free?

A HOME IN A BOARDING HOUSE, at 1822 Calvert St. Convenient location, on the Chevy Chase car line, twelve minutes ride from the business and shopping centres. Bright, sunny rooms,, both double and single. Bath on every floor. Southern cooking. Rates from $35.00 to$ 45.00 a month, according to location of room, and number of meals a day desired.

MRS. ESTELLE WILLOUGHBY IRONS
1822 Calvert Street N. W.

The American Government

By Frederick J. Haskin

A book for any American between the ages of nine and ninety.

This Coupon and Fifty Cents will secure it for you

For additional 15c we will carefully wrap and mail the book to any address. Take advantage of this offer now.

Write to The Suffragist
1420 F Street Washington, D. C.

THE SALE IS LIMITED

Phone, North 2395-2396
WALKER'S MARKET
P. Marion Walker, Prop.
Cor. Twenty-Second and P Streets N. W
Residence, 4307 Wis. Ave. N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Club Offer

The Suffragist, $1 per year
Woman Voter & The News Letter 50c per year
Special Club Rates, $1

The Suffragist, $1
Maryland Suffrage News, $1
Club Rates, $1.30

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS OPPORTUNITY. THE OFFER IS LIMITED
ORDER NOW

THE SUFFRAGIST
1420 F STTREET WASHINGTON, D. C.

Congressional Union Announcements

PROPAGANDA WORK.

Washington, D. C.

On Tuesday the tenth, at eight P. M., Mrs. Estelle Willoughby Ions, of Louisiana, had a meeting for southern women at 1822 Calvert Street. The subject of the speakers was the Constitutional Amendment.

Two very interesting street meetings were held on Friday and Saturday, at Ninth and E Streets and Tenth and Pennsylvania Avenue. The speakers were, Miss Elsie Hill, Mrs. St. Clair Thompson, Mrs. M. E. Brooks, and Miss Doris Stevens.

On Sunday, February the eighth, the first At Home was held at the Headquarters, 1420 F Street. This was an informal gathering and the hostesses were, Mrs. Gilson Gardner, Miss Noyes and Miss Mildred Koonce.

Maryland

On the evening of February ninth, Miss Doris Stevens spoke before the Improvement Association of Baltimore, on the necessity of the action of the legislature on woman suffrage.

On Tuesday, Miss Stevens spoke before the Maryland legislature, at the hearing on the Suffrage Bill.

Delaware

DELAWARE.

On Sunday evening, February 8th, Miss Mabel Vernon addressed the Young Men's Hebrew Association of Wilmington. At the close of a very animated discussion a vote was taken on the suffrage question and a very large favorable majority recorded. During the past week Miss Vernon appeared before two Farmers' Institutes, and on February 12th she presided over a large mass meeting in the Opera House at New Castle. Miss Vernon and Mrs. Florence Bayard spoke. A drawing-room meeting was held on February 13th at the residence of Mrs. Helen Ramfort White, 306 West 20th Street, Wilmington, where Miss Vernon gave an account of the work of the Congressional Union.

PROGRAM OF THE WEEK

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15th.

Washington, D. C. Congressional Union Headquarters, 1420 F Street, 8 P. M. Reception from 4 to 5:30 P. M.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17th.

Washington, D. C. Mrs. Neale's Apartment. The Woodley, 8 P. M. Speaker, Miss Eliza Lord.

Wilmington, Del. Informal Reception for Business Women. Congressional Union Headquarters, 8 P. M.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18th.

Wilmington, Del. Public Speaking Class. Headquarters of Congressional Union. 4 P. M.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19th.

Wilmington, Del. Drawing-room Meeting. Residence of Mrs. J. F. Thomas, 608 King Street. Speaker, Miss Elsie Robelin.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20th.

Washington, D. C. 14th and Kenyon Streets. Open-Air Meeting, 8 P. M. Speakers, Miss Gerschanick, and Mrs. St. Clair Thompson.

FRIDAY FEBRUARY 20th.

Wilmington, Del. Drawing-room Meeting. Residence of Mrs. John Stirlith, 406 Jefferson Street. Speaker, Mrs. Eliza Jones.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14th.

Washington, D. C. 9th and E Streets, and 10th Street and Pa. Avenue. Open-Air Meeting, 8 P. M. Speakers, Miss Loris Stevens, and Miss Elsie Hill.

The Editor of THE SUFFRAGIST requests that all articles sent for publication be typewritten.

The Editor is very glad to read all typewritten articles sent, but wishes to explain why no propaganda for suffrage in general is published in the paper. Only articles bearing directly on the proposed constitutional amendment are desired, as the mission of THE SUFFRAGIST is strictly a national one, dealing with the work for Woman Suffrage in the direct way, through a constitutional amendment.

Hattie M. Shacklette
Facial Massage, Manicuring, Shampooing
611 Fourteenth St,

"SANI-MASSEUR"
Sole Agents and Demonstrator
By this scientific achievement rough skins are made smooth, pale faces are sent away blooming, and wrinkles are made to disappear.

Ever Hear of Typewriter Insurance?

Typewriter Insurance is the difference between the cost of an L. C. Smith & Bros. typewriter and a cheaper machine.

When the L. C. Smith & Bros. typewriter is installed in your office, the typewriter problem is settled once for all. Your correspondence will be a credit to you and you will not be annoyed by breakdowns and delays.

It's a machine of most perfect mechanical construction and therefore highest efficiency. Ball bearing type bars, ball bearing carriages and ball bearing capital shift—this is the explanation.

L. C. Smith & Bros. Typewriter Co.

HOME OFFICE AND FACTORY

Syracuse, N. Y.